

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 and 26 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-24 and 26 are amended. Support for the amendments can be found, for example, in the specification at paragraphs [0109] to [0116] and in the original claims. No new matter is added.

In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

I. Personal Interview

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiners Leonard and Cano during the April 8, 2010 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Office Action rejects claims 1-5, 9, 11-16, 19, 23, 24 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,853,454 to Merger et al. ("Merger"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

A. Claims 1-5, 9, 11-13, 15, 16, 19, 23, 24 and 26

By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended to recite "[a] two-pack polyurethane composition comprising a first pack and a second pack." Specifically, these features clearly indicate that the polyurethane composition comprises two separate packs where the first pack contains the at least one polyurethane prepolymer and the second pack contains the at least one polyaldimine and water. See attached Figures. Merger fails to disclose such features.

Instead, Merger discloses a single-component polyurethane system comprising a polyurethane prepolymer having a polyaldimine, where water may be added to prepare a molded article. See Merger at col. 4, lines 40-45. Merger does not disclose, however, that the polyurethane system comprises two separate packs in which their respective components

are stored. Much less, nowhere in Merger does it disclose that the polyurethane system comprises "a first pack and a second pack" where the first pack comprises at least one polyurethane prepolymer and the second pack comprises water and at least one polyaldimine.

Furthermore, the Office Action, at page 3, asserts that a person of ordinary skill in the art from the disclosure of Merger would have arrived at the claimed composition whenever water is added to the composition. The Office Action further asserts that simply separating the components into two different components is not necessary to arrive at the claimed composition. Examiner Leonard also asserted at the personal interview held on April 8 that there is art that teaches that water can be added at any time during the manufacture of polyurethane adhesives. Applicants respectfully disagree.

It is well known in the art that when water is added during the manufacture of adhesives (i.e., water is added to polyisocyanate), the water immediately reacts with the polyisocyanate resulting in foaming and curing of the polyurethane composition. Such process is applied in the manufacturing of polyurethane foams for use in, for example, mattresses. Merger is directed to reacting water with the polyisocyanate to immediately cure the polyurethane composition. See col. 4, lines 34-45.

In contrast, the two-pack polyurethane composition of claim 1 is used for sealants, coatings and adhesives. See specification at paragraph [0127]. Foaming of the polyurethane composition is avoided during the manufacture of polyurethane compositions used for sealants, coatings and adhesives. All of the components in the claimed two-pack polyurethane composition are thoroughly dried to avoid foaming and to provide bubble-free curing in the polyurethane composition. See specification at paragraphs [0003], [0011] and [0012]. Thus, separating the polyurethane composition into two separate packs is a necessary feature of the claimed composition and is distinguishable from the polyurethane system of Merger.

B. Claim 14

Claim 14 further requires that the second pack has at least one water molecule per aldimine group. The Office Action does not specifically address claim 14 and Merger does not disclose the amount of water that is added to the polyurethane system. Instead, Merger merely discloses that molded articles can be prepared by "mixing the single-component polyurethane system with water and then placing the mixture into a mold." See col. 4, lines 40-45.

C. Conclusion

For at least these reasons, claim 1 is not anticipated by Merger. Claims 2-5, 9, 11-13, 15, 16, 19, 23, 24 and 26 depend from claim 1 and, thus, also are not anticipated by Merger. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

III. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

A. Claims 6-8 and 10

The Office Action rejects claims 6-8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as having been obvious over Merger in view of Jacobsen. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 6-8 and 10 depend from claim 1 and, thus, contain all the features of claim 1. Deficiencies of Merger with respect to claim 1 are discussed above. Jacobsen, which is applied by the Office Action for the additional features recited in claims 6-8 and 10, does not cure deficiencies of Merger with respect to claim 1.

Thus, the applied references would not have rendered obvious claims 6-8 and 10. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

B. Claims 17 and 18

The Office Action rejects claims 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as having been obvious over Merger in view of Reisch. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 17 and 18 depend from claim 1 and, thus, contain all the features of claim 1. Deficiencies of Merger with respect to claim 1 are discussed above. Reisch, which is applied by the Office Action for the additional features recited in claims 17 and 18, does not cure deficiencies of Merger with respect to claim 1.

Thus, the applied references would not have rendered obvious claims 17 and 18. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

C. Claims 20-22

The Office Action rejects claims 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as having been obvious over Merger in view of Piestert. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 20-22 depend from claim 1 and, thus, contain all the features of claim 1. Deficiencies of Merger with respect to claim 1 are discussed above. Piestert, which is applied by the Office Action for the additional features recited in claims 20-22, does not cure the deficiencies of Merger with respect to claim 1.

Thus, the applied references would not have rendered obvious claims 20-22. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-24 and 26 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Tommy T. Kim
Registration No. L0543

JAO:TTK/rle

Attachments:

Figure Sheet
Request for Continued Examination
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: April 30, 2010

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry of this filing;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461